UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,642	05/01/2001	Luciano Lavagno	CA7012162001	6620

55497   7590   03/12/2010
VISTA IP LAW GROUP LLP
1885 Lundy Avenue
Suite 108
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER
GUILL, RUSSELL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2123	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Response to Rule 312 Communication	09/847,642	LAVAGNO ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Russ Guill	2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

1. ☒ The amendment filed on <u>01 March 2010</u> under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

   a) ☐ entered.

   b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.

   c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

      Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1)

      and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

   d) ☒ disapproved. See explanation below.

   e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

   Applicant's amendment of claim 41, line 3, is disapproved, because the term in line 2, "said processor" lacks antecedent basis. The Examiner's amendment replaced the first occurrence of "said processor" with "a processor".

   Applicant's amendment of claim 55, line 17, is disapproved because the term "the assembly language module software" lacks antecedent basis. The Examiner's amendment used the term "the assembly language software module" which appears to have antecedent basis.

   Applicant's amendment to claim 62 does not appear to agree with the Examiner's amendment, and is disapproved, at least because an apparent grammar error renders the relationships between the elements of the claim unclear, and thus the claim is indefinite. The Applicant's amendment also does not appear to agree with the Applicant's submitted "proposed amendment to the claims" submitted on November 5, 2009.

   While the Applicant remarked that issues were noticed with Examiner's amendment in the December 1, 2009, Notice of Allowability, the Applicant did not identify the specific issues, and thus the above mentioned issues may not be complete because they were determined by direct comparison of all claim amendments for 64 claims. In order to expedite the examination process, the Examiner respectfully requests that all specific issues be enumerated and identified.

/Paul L Rodriguez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2123